



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,398	09/12/2003	H. Robert Horvitz	01997/548003	7921
21559	7590	05/13/2010		
CLARK & ELBING LLP 101 FEDERAL STREET BOSTON, MA 02110			EXAMINER HIBBERT, CATHERINE S	
			ART UNIT 1636	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 05/13/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentadministrator@clarkelbing.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/661,398

Applicant(s)

HORVITZ ET AL.

Examiner

CATHERINE HIBBERT

Art Unit

1636

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 22-25, 27-29, 31-33 and 35-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 22-25, 27-29, 31-33 and 35-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' Amendment to the Claims filed 25 January 2010 has been received and entered. Claims 3-21, 26, 30 and 34 are cancelled. Claims 35-38 are new. Claims 1-2, 22-25, 27-29, 31-33 and 35-38 are pending and under examination in this action.

Response to Amendment

Any objections and rejections not repeated herein are withdrawn.

New grounds of rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-2, 22-25, 27-29, 31-33 and 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant claim methods for identifying a candidate compound for treating neoplasia, the methods comprising the step of contacting a *C. elegans* vulval precursor cell comprising a nucleic acid sequence containing a loss of function mutation, wherein the nucleic acid sequence containing the loss of function mutation has at least 95% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:24 (base claim 1), SEQ ID NO:26 (base claim 23), SEQ ID NO:28 (base claim 27), or SEQ ID

Art Unit: 1636

NO:2 (base claim 31). The claims read on methods that entail the use of a broad genus of sequences.

The MPEP states that the purpose of the written description requirement is to ensure that the inventor had possession, as of the filing date of the application, of the specific subject matter later claimed by him. The courts have stated [see especially *Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly & Co.* Appeal from the US District Court for the District of MA (Decided 3 April 2009) where claims were held to be unpatentable for failing to comply with the written description requirement] that:

The written description requirement, “serves both to satisfy the inventor’s obligation to disclose the technologic knowledge upon which the patent is based, and to demonstrate that the patentee was in possession of the invention that is claimed.” *Capon v. Eshhar*, 418 F.3d 1349, 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2005). The requirement “serves a teaching function, as a *quid pro quo* in which the public is given meaningful disclosure in exchange for being excluded from practicing the invention for a limited period of time.” *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 358 F.3d 916, 922 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (quoting *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe Inc.*, 323 F.3d 956, 970 (Fed. Cir. 2002)); see *O’Reilly v. Morse*, 56 U.S. (15 How.) 62, 121 (1853) (explaining that a patentee “can lawfully claim only what he has invented and described, and if he claims more his patent is void”); *Reiffen v. Microsoft Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1343, 1345–46 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (“The purpose of [the written description requirement] is to ensure that the scope of the right to exclude . . . does not overreach the scope of the inventor’s contribution to the field of art as described in the patent specification.”).

“Whether the written description requirement is satisfied is a fact-based inquiry that will depend on the nature of the claimed invention and the knowledge of one skilled in the art at the time an invention is made and a patent application is filed.” *Carnegie Mellon*, 541 F.3d at 1122 (citing *Enzo*, 323 F.3d at 963). The written description requirement is not satisfied by “[t]he appearance of mere indistinct words in a specification or a claim, even an original claim. . . . A description of what a material does, rather than of what it is, usually does not suffice.” *Enzo*, 323 F.3d at 968 (citing *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568); see *Rochester*, 358 F.3d at 926 (“[G]eneralized language may not suffice if it does not convey the detailed identity of an invention.”).

The same is true for both process claims and composition claims. *Rochester*, 358 F.3d at 926 (“Regardless whether a compound is claimed per se or a method is claimed that entails the use of the compound, the inventor cannot lay claim to that subject matter unless he can provide a description of the compound sufficient to distinguish infringing

Art Unit: 1636

compounds from non-infringing compounds, or infringing methods from non-infringing methods.”). Where the specification provides only constructive examples in lieu of working examples, it must still “describe the claimed subject matter in terms that establish that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention, including all of the elements and limitations.” *Id.* (citing *Hyatt v. Boone*, 146 F.3d 1348, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1998)).

Further, for a broad generic claim, the specification must provide adequate written description to identify the genus of the claim. In *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.* the court stated:

“A written description of an invention involving a chemical genus, like a description of a chemical species, ‘requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, [or] chemical name,’ of the claimed subject matter sufficient to distinguish it from other materials.” *Fiers*, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601; *In re Smythe*, 480 F.2d 1376, 1383, 178 USPQ 279, 284985 (CCPA 1973) (“In other cases, particularly but not necessarily, chemical cases, where there is unpredictability in performance of certain species or subcombinations other than those specifically enumerated, one skilled in the art may be found not to have been placed in possession of a genus ...”) *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 43 USPQ2d 1398.

In the instant case, the specification does not sufficiently describe a representative number of functional mutants (i.e. *C. elegans* vulval precursor cells comprising a nucleic acid sequence containing a loss of function mutation) wherein the nucleic acid sequence containing the loss of function mutation has at least 95% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:24 (base claim 1), SEQ ID NO:26 (base claim 23), SEQ ID NO:28 (base claim 27), or SEQ ID NO:2 (base claim 31) by actual reduction to practice or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics and thus the skilled artisan cannot envision a sufficient number of embodiments of the instant invention from the instant specification because the specification only discloses SEQ ID NO:24, SEQ ID NO:26, SEQ ID NO:28, or SEQ ID NO:2.

The state of the art at the time of filing does not provide sufficient information on the subject to overcome the deficiencies of the instant specification. There is no description in the art that allows one to envision a representative number of functional mutants by disclosing structural or functional features of sequences having 95% sequence identity to SEQ ID NO:24, SEQ ID NO:26, SEQ ID NO:28, or SEQ ID NO:2 so that one of skill in the art could envision the claimed invention. Thus the skilled artisan cannot consult the art at the time of filing to envision a sufficient number of embodiments of the instant invention to see that the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus.

The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See *In re Wilder*, 736, F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 USPQ 369, 372-73 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate.") Accordingly, it is deemed that the specification fails to provide adequate written description for the genus of the claims and does not reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the entire scope of the claimed invention.

Conclusion

No claims allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CATHERINE HIBBERT, whose telephone number is (571)270-3053. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5PM, EST.

Art Unit: 1636

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached on 571-272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/NANCY VOGEL/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1636

Catherine Hibbert
Examiner AU1636